# **Stage 3 Constructability Review Recommendations**

Constructability reviews are intended to improve the effectiveness of a set of plans, specifications and bid documents. The plans should be clear for the contractor to be able to provide accurate bids and understand INDOT's requirements during construction.

The basic objective of the Constructability Review is to seek out overlooked problems that increase costs, impair the schedule, and decrease quality and safety margins.

The Stage 3 Review is conducted jointly by the Project Manager and the Construction Manager to achieve the best bid package.

Stage 3 Review occurs at the Final Plan Package. The intent of the Stage 3 plans is to have the plans, special provisions and cost estimates in final form.

- Final Field Check and Constructability/Utility Conference comments have been accounted for.
- Right of Way is complete or accounted for.
- Utilities Permits and NTP have been issued or accounted for.
- If required, Railroad Permits and NTP have been issued.
- Final Construction Cost Estimate and Final Special Provisions (including all water way permits) are complete.
- Compare the cost estimate with the quantity calculations, quantity tables in the plan set, and look for any missing pay items.

### **Items to Review at Stage 3**

- Check for conflicts between items and plans and special provisions and specifications. They should be consistent throughout.
- Check for any specification updates that might impact the item needed.
- The items used need to match the specification items.
- Watch for specialty items that have supplemental descriptions.

#### Stage 3 Constructability Review cont'd

### **Stage 3 Documents**

- Stage 3 Plans
- Final Field Check Meeting Minutes
- Constructability/Utility Review Minutes
- Special Provisions
- Permits (Environmental, Railroad, & Utility)
- Final Environmental Document
- Rule 5 Erosion Control Submission
- Geotechnical Investigation Report
- Pavement Design Approval
- Hazardous Materials Investigation Report
- Quantity Calculations
- Cost Estimate
- Transportation Management Plan
- Commitment Report

### **Commonly Missed Items to Check**

- Pavement removal
- RPM removal
- Remove traffic signal
- Line removal for phasing
- Pavement message marking removal
- Pipe removal. Either include an item for this and quantify it with a table or include it in clearing or right of way.
- CZ units for barrier wall
- Mob/Demob for seeding
- Missed pavement marking items
- Road closure sign assemblies

#### Stage 3 Constructability Review cont'd

#### **Other Considerations**

- A "clearing of R/W" description helps.
- "HMA for approaches" conflicts between specs, plans and special provisions.
- Sometime it is better to not have an item rather than to do a "just in case" item that is undistributed.
- Low quantity items can hurt us, especially if there is a "quantity basis".
- Usage of Message Boards is not "per day". It should be "each".
- The direction sign on the Detour Route Marker assemblies are left out of the plans.
- Barricade quantities are too low.
- Preformed loops rarely work into the phasing.
- Asphalt pavement vs. concrete: Is there enough room for construction staging for concrete pavement.



## Indiana Department of Transportation

## **Project Constructability Review 3**

## Stage 3 Plan Review Submission

# **Construction Manager/Project Manager**

| Primary DES No.      | Contract No. |  |
|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Route                | District     |  |
| Work Type            | RFC Date     |  |
| Project Location     |              |  |
|                      |              |  |
| County/City/Town     | Designer     |  |
| Project Manager      |              |  |
| Construction Manager | Date         |  |

# **Evaluation of Project Constructability Quality**

|     | Evaluation Criteria  | Υ | N | N/A  | Note | Flag |
|-----|--|---|---|------|------|------|
| i T | CONSTRUCTABILITY   |   |   |      |      |      |
| Α   | . Plans Road   |   |   | 1000 |      |      |
| *   | Are conflicts between plans and standard drawings?   |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 2. Are control points included and match the work to existing conditions?  |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 3. Can existing drainage patterns be maintained during construction?   |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 4. Has sufficient field investigation been done to ascertain that<br>contract work can be performed as shown on the plans? |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | <ol><li>Current site survey (horizontal &amp; vertical controls)?</li></ol>  |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 6. Soils stabilization?  |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 7. Are clearing and grubbing limits identified?  |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 8. Is the quantity of borrow shown on the plans?   |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 9. Any presence of ground water or active streams?   |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | <ol> <li>Is sheeting or shoring necessary to protect roadway? If so, an<br/>item will be required.</li> </ol>              |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 11. Do driveway/turnout grades meet allowable standards?   |   |   |      |      |      |
| *   | 12. Have the mitigation requirements been identified & plans developed?  |   |   |      |      |      |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

|   |  |          |          |                       |          | v. 07-14-1                                       |
|---|--|----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|--|
|   | Evaluation Criteria  | Υ        | N        | N/A                   | Note     | Flag   |
| * | 13. If staged construction, has balance of cuts and fills been done      |          |          |                       |          |  |
| 1 | for each stage? Are temporary stockpile locations identified on          |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | the plans, if needed?  | <u> </u> |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 14. Are the utilities and drainage shown on the Cross sections?          |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 15. Is drainage properly controlled at the ends of structures?           |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 16. Do the pipe sizes and angles fit the existing drainage               |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | structures?  |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 17. Is there sufficient R/W to trench drainage structures?               |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 18. Are special structures required because of pipe size or number       |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | of pipes?  |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 19. Check for conflicts with existing/proposed drainage.                 |          |          |                       |          |  |
| Ε | B. Plans - Bridge  | NIC.     |          | ingering<br>Referensi |          |  |
| * | 1. Any vertical activity (i.e., pre-drilled holes for piling) required   |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | inside MSE wall area that conflict with tie backs?                       |          |          | ļ <u>.</u>            |          |  |
| * | 2. Have foundation locations been checked for ROW                        |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | infringements?   |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 3. Are control points noted from project limits to project limits?       |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 4. Control points should be on both sides of a structure.                |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * |  |          |          |                       |          | ļ  |
| * | 6. Is dewatering required?   |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 7. Has substructure been examined for scour?                             |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 8. Is cofferdam required?  |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 9. Ensure that when cofferdam and pumping is an item in the              | Π        |          |                       |          |  |
| ſ | contract, wet excavation is also an item. Is underwater (tremie)         |          |          |                       |          | :  |
|   | concrete required?   |          |          |                       |          |  |
| * | 10. Are there conflicts between existing foundations and proposed        |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | foundations?   |          |          | <u> </u>              |          |  |
| * | 11. Are there drainage structures that would conflict with the bridge    |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | foundations or retaining walls?  |          |          | <u> </u>              |          |  |
| * | 12. Is shoring required to build the structure?                          |          |          | 1                     |          |  |
| * | 1 13. 13 there enough footh, both horizontal and vertical, to concuract  |          |          |                       |          |  |
|   | typical shoring methods between construction phases?                     |          | _        |                       |          | <u> </u>   |
| * | 14. I citilis for everiengin loads to the jet readilie.                  |          |          | <u> </u>              |          |  |
| * | 15. Are truck turnaround areas available?                                | 1        | ↓        | <del> </del>          |          |  |
| * | 16. Are there any limitations in erecting large (particularly long)      |          |          |                       |          |  |
| l | heavy bridge members? Crane size? Crane transporting? Crane              |          |          |                       |          |  |
| L | erecting positions? Costs? Project structure location?                   | +        | <u> </u> |                       | <u> </u> | <u> </u>   |
| * | 17. Does the contract require a bridge erection sequence?                | +        | <u> </u> | -                     |          | <del> </del>                                     |
| * | 16. Are the details for creation, bracking or stabilization or otractard |          |          |                       |          |  |
| Ŀ | members sufficient?  | +        | 1        | -                     | 1        | <del>                                     </del> |
| Ľ | 19. 13 Hilliman Bridge Vertical clearance offern on the plane.           | <u> </u> | +-       | ┩                     | +        | ļ  |
| * | 20. Is there a pour sequence shown in the plans? Can it be               |          |          |                       |          |  |
| L | modified or are special circumstances described in the plans?            |          | 1        |                       |          |  |

<sup>∵</sup>roject Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Γ       | Evaluation Criteria   | Υ        | N            | N/A     | Note   | v. 07-14-10<br>Flag |
|---------|---|----------|--------------|---------|--|---------------------|
| * 2     | Is all previous repair work noted on the plans or as-built?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 2. Is a backfilling sequence needed on abutments or wing walls to                                     |          |              |         |  |                     |
| -       | prevent "overturn" condition?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 2     | Does falsework over traffic provide clearance?  |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 4. If stage construction, are bridge rebar splices needed and   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| -       | specified how to achieve?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 2     | 5. Vibrator space around rebar?   |          |              |         |  | ·                   |
|         | 6. Rebar congestion at pier caps?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 7. Verify screed elevations and dead load camber for accuracy?  |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 8. Is there adequate room to install anchor bolts for bearing assemblies?                             |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 0     | 9. Are the wingwalls too long to be supported without a pile?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | Are closure pours required for bridges with phased  |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | construction?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 1. Do post-tensioned elements provide enough room for the PT<br>Jacking equipment?                    |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 2. Review the pour sequence for a multi-span structure. Is it achievable?                             |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 3. If steel bridge built on skew, ensure there is enough room at                                      |          |              |         |  |                     |
| `       | bearings to torque the bolts.   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 4. Emergency/interim structural repairs been considered?  | 1        |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 5. Winter concreting?   |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 6. Can the roadway and/or structures handle the load of this piece                                    |          |              |         |  |                     |
| $\perp$ | of equipment, the paving train?   | <b>-</b> |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 37. Is bridge construction phasing consistent with road construction phasing? (horizontal & vertical) |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 3     | 88. Does the median bridge rail on divided highways create horizontal sight distance restrictions?    |          |              |         | :  |                     |
| * (     | 39. Are the details for erection, bracing or stabilization of structural members sufficient?          |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 10. Are critical dimensions given within reasonable tolerances?                                       | 1        |              |         |  |                     |
|         | 11. If stage construction, are bridge rebar splices needed and specified how to achieve?              |          |              |         |  |                     |
| * 4     | 12. Does temporary illumination also include under bridge   |          |              |         |  |                     |
|         | luminaries?   | 1        | <del> </del> |         | <del> </del>                                     |                     |
|         | 43. Check sign/light foundations on bridges for utility conflicts.                                    |          |              |         |  |                     |
| C.      | Pay Items   |          |              |         |  |                     |
| 1       | 1. Are pay items appropriate?   | +        | ╂            |         | <del>                                     </del> |                     |
| *       | 2. Are pay items accurate?  | ╫        | 1            |         | <del> </del>                                     |                     |
| *       | 3. Are pay items consistent with specifications?  | +        | -            | 1-      | 1  |                     |
| *       | 4. Do pay items reflect scope of work?  | -        | 1-           |         |  | <b>-</b>            |
| *       | 5. Missing pay items?   | +        | <del> </del> | <b></b> |  |                     |
|         | 6. Are all temporary items for maintenance of traffic included?                                       |          |              | J       | <u> 1</u>  |                     |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

|   | ,              |  |  | Re           | v. 07-14-1   |
|---|----------------|--|--|--------------|--|
| Evaluation Criteria   | Υ              | N  | N/A  | Note         | Flag   |
| * 7. Are pay item descriptions sufficient?  |                |  |  |              |  |
| 8. Are privately owned services involved? Is there a bid item for these relocations?                              | :              |  |  |              |  |
| * 9. Are cost estimates and unit prices appropriate for type of project and construction schedule considerations? |                |  |  |              |  |
| * 10. Are appropriate parties involved with this review?  | ┢              |  |  |              |  |
| * 11. Any proprietary materials specified?  | _              |  |  |              |  |
| D. Quantities   |                |  | in Grande d                                      |              | 1 1 1000   |
| * 1. Are billed materials tables accurate?  | 33545          |  |  |              |  |
| * 2. Are quantities reliable and verifiable?  |                |  |  |              |  |
|   |                | <del> </del>                                     |  |              |  |
| review?   |                |  |  |              |  |
| * 4. Final quantity calculations of Road and Bridge Plans should be   |                |  |  |              |  |
| checked for overlap as well as missing items. Examples would  |                |  |  |              |  |
| be fill and excavation quantities, guardrail, guardrail removal,  |                |  |  |              |  |
| temporary shoring, pavement removal, and MOT items.   | -<br>          | .9 9.  | storeday day                                     | usvenundus(N | AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O |
| E. Special Provisions   | 1997           | 1000   | 2000   | estusies (   |  |
| 1. Is a degree of nexibility included in the bloding documents:   | -              |  |  |              |  |
| * 2. Do special provisions reflect work to be performed?  | <u> </u>       |  |  |              |  |
| 3. Do special provisions include measurement and basis of payment?  |                |  |  |              |  |
| 4. Are any special provisions omitted?  |                |  |  |              |  |
| 5. Are coordination and agreements with appropriate agencies/parties included?                                    |                | •  |  |              |  |
| 6. Are there any apparent conflicts between plans, specifications or special provisions?                          |                |  |  |              |  |
| 7. Is cross referencing between various contract documents consistent?  |                |  |  |              |  |
| * 8. Are there unique special provisions due to proposed phasing?   |                |  |  |              | **   |
| * 9. Are all required permits detailed in special provisions?   |                |  |  |              |  |
| 10. Are all permit conditions that are applicable to construction activity clearly detailed?                      |                |  |  |              |  |
| 11. Does staging cause special conditions (i.e. structural adequacy/stability)?                                   |                |  |  |              |  |
| 12. Proposed adjacent contracts, restrictions, constraints identified and accounted for?                          |                |  |  |              |  |
| * 13. Required lanes and closure periods clearly identified?  |                | $\vdash$   |  | -            |  |
| 14. Any special (unique/proprietary) materials, methods or  | $\vdash$       | <u> </u>   | <b> </b>   |              |  |
| technologies required for contract?   |                |  |  |              |  |
| * 15. Special coordination required, RR, Permits, Regulatory?   |                | <del>                                     </del> | <del>                                     </del> |              | <b></b>  |
| * 16. Presence of asbestos, hazardous waste or toxic materials?   | <del>  -</del> | ╁──  |  | <del></del>  |  |
| * 17. Safety requirements, fall protection, electric lines, and other   | f              |  |  |              |  |
| utilities, RR requirements?   | <u> </u>       |  |  | <u> </u>     |  |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Evaluation C   | iteria   | Y         | N               | N/A           | Note            | v. 07-14-1<br>Flag |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| * 18. Has use of proprietary items bee   | n approved?  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 19. Are there any special construction   |  | 一         |                 |               |                 |                    |
| need to be described or conside  | red?   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 20. Are utilities to be maintained during  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| provisions in place?   |  |           | 1               | l             |                 |                    |
| * 21. Are any substations or utility app   | ırtenances within the  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| construction area required to be a   |  |           |                 |               |                 | :                  |
| If so, have provisions been includ   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 22. Railroad protection or flagger iter  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| needed. Has a force account with   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 23. Are the environmental restriction  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 24. Have Unique Special Revisions r  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| phasing been drafted?  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 25. Are unique Special Provisions de   | veloped as needed?   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| F Utilities and Railroad   |  |           |                 |               |                 | i novajej          |
| * 1. Are utility conflicts identified?   | The Control of the Co | 100000-35 | 10000-10000-100 | minery is the | 34.45           |                    |
| Are utility relocations reasonable   | .?   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 3. Are there construction conflicts v  |  | -         |                 |               |                 |                    |
| utilities?   | vitir underground/overnedd   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 4. Is Right-of-Way conducive to util   | ity relocations?   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 5. Does project phasing address ut   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 6. Do utilities conflict with drainage   |  | $\vdash$  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 7. Utilities investigation (verification   |  | <u> </u>  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| relocations)?  | of plans, scriedule, and   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
|  | n nione?   | <u> </u>  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 8. Are all known utilities indicated o   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| 9. Will overhead utilities be in conflict the use of construction and the use of |  | ļ         |                 | ·             |                 |                    |
| and/or the use of construction eq  |  |           | 1               |               |                 |                    |
| drivers? If so, should they be relo  |  | _         |                 |               |                 | -                  |
| * 10. Identify utility drainage conflicts of   |  | ┢         |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 11. Check driveways/sidewalks for c  |  | -         | _               |               |                 |                    |
| * 12. Is railroad coordination in progre   |  | 53548     | Sistem 1        |               | 98705A.1.1.5.1. | ur tar bagiles     |
| E. Environmental   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 1. Environmental restrictions period   |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 2. Are erosion and pollution contro  |  | <b> </b>  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 3. Have all permit requirements be   |  | <u> </u>  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 4. Are dust and noise control meas   |  | <u> </u>  |                 | <u> </u>      | <u> </u>        |                    |
| 5. Are provisions in plans and/or b  |  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| turbidity barriers, etc. considere   |  | <u> </u>  | <b>!</b>        |               | <u> </u>        |                    |
| * 6. Will utility work impact contamina  | •  |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| perform this work in the agreeme   |  | <u> </u>  | <u> </u>        | <u> </u>      | <u> </u>        |                    |
| 7. Are required environmental perr   | nits identified & applications   |           |                 |               |                 |                    |
| drafted?   |  | <u> </u>  |                 |               |                 |                    |
| * 8. Any Environmental active comm   | itment instead of permits?   |           | <u> </u>        |               |                 |                    |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Evaluation Criteria   | Υ                 | N  | N/A                | Note | Flag  |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------------|------|---|
| * 9. If contamination exists on the site, have the proper type and      |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| quantity of borings and pump tests been performed?                      |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 10. If contaminated soil, are there provisions for handling/treating? |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 11. If the work is located adjacent to a residential area or occupied |                   |  |                    | ·    |   |
| building, provisions may be required to minimize the impact of          |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| noise producing activities, such as restricted work hours or            |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| temporary noise barriers.   | No. No. St. of to | frite here was                                   | College States (A) |      | The above the   |
| H. Right of Way   |                   | 145  |                    |      |   |
| * 1. Sufficient R/W available for all operations?                       | 1                 | <u> </u>   |                    |      |   |
| 2. Is temporary R/W for construction access identified?                 |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 3. Is the Right-of-Way conducive to utility relocates?                |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| 4. Is there sufficient R/W to relocate all utilities?                   |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 5. Does R/W account for buried drainage features?                     |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 6. Is R/W straight to allow for power pole runs without a bunch of    |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| down guys?  |                   | :  |                    |      |   |
| I. Construction Phasing   |                   | W. 6   |                    |      | 111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>111<br>11 |
| 1. Are work zone widths adequate for construction equipment             |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| needs?  |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| 2. Are there grade changes between phases that won't allow              |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| access to adjacent properties?  |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| 3. Is there enough horizontal clearance for barriers, shoring, and      |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| construction access?  |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| 4. Are there areas with restricted access?                              |                   |  | <u> </u>           |      |   |
| * 5. Are work zone widths adequate for construction equipment           |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| needs?  |                   | <u> </u>   |                    |      |   |
| * 6. Are travel lanes adequate?   |                   |  | <u></u>            |      |   |
| * 7. Project phasing considered drainage construction?                  |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| * 8. Does staging cause special conditions (i.e. structural             | 1                 |  |                    |      |   |
| adequacy/stability)? If shoulders are required to carry traffic         |                   |  | İ                  |      |   |
| during stage construction, are they structurally adequate or            |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| should reconstruction be required?                                      | +                 |  | <u> </u>           |      |   |
| 9. Are these grade changes between phases that won't allow              |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| access to adjacent properties?  | +                 | -  | <u> </u>           |      | <u> </u>  |
| * 10. Do the utility relocation plans work for all phases of            |                   | 1  |                    |      |   |
| construction?   | +                 | <del>                                     </del> | -                  |      |   |
| * 11. Are comments from previous review adequately addressed?           |                   | <del> </del>                                     | 1                  |      |   |
| * 12. Any subdivisions or commercial/industrial areas not indicated?    |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| Conflicts with adjacent projects, if any?                               | -                 | 1  |                    |      | ļ   |
| 13. Was the designer conservative in locating phase lines               |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| (horizontally) to allow the contractor greater flexibility during       |                   |  |                    |      |   |
| construction?   |                   |  |                    |      |   |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Evaluation Criteria  | Υ  | N   | N/A  | Note   | v. 07-14-1<br>Flag   |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | 1828   |   |  |  |  |
|  | 10.032.04  | 14670, 176.3  |  |  |  |
|  | _  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
| properties?  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6. Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and           |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 7. Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?              |  |   |  |  |  |
| 8. Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with        |  |   |  |  |  |
| local conditions?  |  |   |  |  |  |
| 9. Is special access required to adjacent property?                      | <u> </u>   |   |  |  |  |
| 10. Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences          |  |   |  |  |  |
| provided throughout the project duration?                                | <u> </u>   |   | <u> </u>   |  |  |
|  |  |   | 1  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                    |  |   |  |  |  |
|  | <u> </u>   | -   |  |  |  |
|  | <u> </u>   | <u> </u>  | <u> </u>   |  |  |
|  | _  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|  | <u> </u>   |   | <u> </u>   | <u> </u>   |  |
|  |  |   | <del>                                     </del>   |  |  |
|  |  | <u> </u>  | <u> </u>   |  |  |
| 17. Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes? | <u></u>  |   |  |  |  |
| 18. Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for                     |  |   |  |  |  |
| construction operations?   |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  | •  |  |
|  | <u> </u>   | ļ   | ļ  |  |  |
|  | _  |   |  | <u> </u>   |  |
|  | <u> </u>   |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  | ĺ  |
| construction phasing and property owner access been considered?          |  |   |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Letting schedule is appropriate for desired completion date              |  |   |  |  |  |
| Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project    |  |   |  |  |  |
| Schedule addresses environmental restriction periods                     |  |   |  |  |  |
| Schedule addresses local events, holidays, etc.                          |  |   |  |  |  |
| Schedule addresses special material procurement time                     |  |   |  |  |  |
|  | <ol> <li>Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and barricades encroaching on lanes?</li> <li>Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?</li> <li>Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with local conditions?</li> <li>Is special access required to adjacent property?</li> <li>Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences provided throughout the project duration?</li> <li>Has consideration been given to depth of total pavement section (including sub-grade treatment and profile changes) for safety and access?</li> <li>Design adequate for averting delays/congestion?</li> <li>Is detour necessary for averting delays/congestion?</li> <li>Determine if there are any other projects that may be in construction along the detour route.</li> <li>Are there any RR crossings located in the proposed detour?</li> <li>Adequate turn lanes provided to avoid traffic backups?</li> <li>Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes?</li> <li>Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for construction operations?</li> <li>Are conflicts with other work in area of project being addressed?</li> <li>Can emergency vehicles travel through zones without delays?</li> <li>Is there adequate vertical clearance in all phases of the MOT?</li> <li>Are approach and driveway grade appropriate and has construction phasing and property owner access been considered?</li> <li>Schedule &amp; Special Considerations</li> <li>Letting schedule is appropriate for desired completion date</li> <li>Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project</li> <li>Schedule addresses environmental restriction periods</li> <li>Schedule addresses local events, holidays, etc.</li> </ol> | <ol> <li>Traffic Maintenance &amp; Traffic Management Plans</li> <li>Are lane closures reasonable for traffic volumes?</li> <li>Emergency vehicle travel through closure areas?</li> <li>"Drop offs" due to construction phasing addressed to safely maintain traffic lanes.</li> <li>Pedestrian, bicycle, ADA needs considered?</li> <li>Adequate provisions for access for pedestrians and abutting properties?</li> <li>Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and barricades encroaching on lanes?</li> <li>Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?</li> <li>Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with local conditions?</li> <li>Is special access required to adjacent property?</li> <li>Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences provided throughout the project duration?</li> <li>Has consideration been given to depth of total pavement section (including sub-grade treatment and profile changes) for safety and access?</li> <li>Design adequate for averting delays/congestion?</li> <li>Is detour necessary for averting delays/congestion?</li> <li>Determine if there are any other projects that may be in construction along the detour route.</li> <li>Are there any RR crossings located in the proposed detour?</li> <li>Adequate turn lanes provided to avoid traffic backups?</li> <li>Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes?</li> <li>Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for construction operations?</li> <li>Are conflicts with other work in area of project being addressed?</li> <li>Can emergency vehicles travel through zones without delays?</li> <li>Is there adequate vertical clearance in all phases of the MOT?</li> <li>Are approach and driveway grade appropriate and has construction phasing and property owner access been considered?</li> <li>Schedule &amp; Special Considerations</li> <li>Letting schedule is appropriate for desired completion date</li></ol> | Traffic Maintenance & Traffic Management Plans  1. Are lane closures reasonable for traffic volumes?  2. Emergency vehicle travel through closure areas?  3. "Drop offs" due to construction phasing addressed to safely maintain traffic lanes.  4. Pedestrian, bicycle, ADA needs considered?  5. Adequate provisions for access for pedestrians and abutting properties?  6. Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and barricades encroaching on lanes?  7. Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?  8. Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with local conditions?  9. Is special access required to adjacent property?  10. Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences provided throughout the project duration?  11. Has consideration been given to depth of total pavement section (including sub-grade treatment and profile changes) for safety and access?  12. Design adequate for averting delays/congestion?  13. Is detour necessary for averting delays/congestion?  14. Determine if there are any other projects that may be in construction along the detour route.  15. Are there any RR crossings located in the proposed detour?  16. Adequate turn lanes provided to avoid traffic backups?  17. Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes?  18. Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for construction operations?  19. Are conflicts with other work in area of project being addressed?  20. Can emergency vehicles travel through zones without delays?  21. Is there adequate vertical clearance in all phases of the MOT?  22. Are approach and driveway grade appropriate and has construction phasing and property owner access been considered?  3. Schedule & Special Considerations  1. Letting schedule is appropriate for desired completion date  2. Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project  3. Schedule addresses environmental restriction periods  4. Schedule addresses local events, holidays, etc. | Traffic Maintenance & Traffic Management Plans  1. Are lane closures reasonable for traffic volumes?  2. Emergency vehicle travel through closure areas?  3. "Drop offs" due to construction phasing addressed to safely maintain traffic lanes.  4. Pedestrian, bicycle, ADA needs considered?  5. Adequate provisions for access for pedestrians and abutting properties?  6. Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and barricades encroaching on lanes?  7. Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?  8. Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with local conditions?  9. Is special access required to adjacent property?  10. Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences provided throughout the project duration?  11. Has consideration been given to depth of total pavement section (including sub-grade treatment and profile changes) for safety and access?  12. Design adequate for averting delays/congestion?  13. Is detour necessary for averting delays/congestion?  14. Determine if there are any other projects that may be in construction along the detour route.  15. Are there any RR crossings located in the proposed detour?  16. Adequate turn lanes provided to avoid traffic backups?  17. Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes?  18. Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for construction operations?  19. Are conflicts with other work in area of project being addressed?  20. Can emergency vehicles travel through zones without delays?  21. Is there adequate vertical clearance in all phases of the MOT?  22. Are approach and driveway grade appropriate and has construction phasing and property owner access been considered?  3. Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project  4. Schedule addresses environmental restriction periods  4. Schedule addresses local events, holidays, etc. | Traffic Maintenance & Traffic Management Plans  1. Are lane closures reasonable for traffic volumes?  2. Emergency vehicle travel through closure areas?  3. "Drop offs" due to construction phasing addressed to safely maintain traffic lanes.  4. Pedestrian, bicycle, ADA needs considered?  5. Adequate provisions for access for pedestrians and abutting properties?  6. Are location of traffic control signs, warning devices, and barricades encroaching on lanes?  7. Are exits and entrances to work zones adequate and safe?  8. Are lanes on which traffic is to be maintained compatible with local conditions?  9. Is special access required to adjacent property?  10. Is safe pedestrian access and access to business/residences provided throughout the project duration?  11. Has consideration been given to depth of total pavement section (including sub-grade treatment and profile changes) for safety and access?  12. Design adequate for averting delays/congestion?  13. Is detour necessary for averting delays/congestion?  14. Determine if there are any other projects that may be in construction along the detour route.  15. Are there any RR crossings located in the proposed detour?  16. Adequate turn lanes provided to avoid traffic backups?  17. Does the TMP adequately address site conditions and traffic volumes?  18. Does the MOT plan address adequate work area for construction operations?  19. Are conflicts with other work in area of project being addressed?  20. Can emergency vehicles travel through zones without delays?  21. Is there adequate vertical clearance in all phases of the MOT?  22. Are approach and driveway grade appropriate and has construction phasing and property owner access been considered?  8. Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project  19. Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project  20. Schedule addresses other work in area or related contracts in project  21. Schedule addresses local events, holidays, etc. |

²roject Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Evaluation Criteria   | Υ | N            | N/A | Note   | Flag       |
|---|---|--------------|-----|--|------------|
| 6. Schedule addresses removal of hazardous materials as   |   |              |     |  |            |
| necessary   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 7. Schedule addresses utility relocation timeline   |   |              |     |  |            |
| Schedule addresses railroad coordination as necessary   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 9. Length of time and production rates for work reasonable?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 10. Is sequence of construction reasonable?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 11. Seasonal limits on construction operations?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 12. Utility relocation schedule reasonable?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 13. Regulatory permit restrictions?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 14. Processing of shop drawings and related approvals?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 15. Materials ordering, fabrication, and delivery requirements?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 16. Restricted hours impact on production?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 17. All necessary construction operations identified?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 18. Relationship with adjacent contracts?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 19. Impact of additional work? Costs?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 20. Time related specs – completion/milestone realistic? Costs?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 21. Night and weekend work proposed and impacts considered?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| Costs?  |   |              |     | ļ  |            |
| 22. Does schedule address other work in area or related contracts   |   |              |     |  |            |
| in project?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 23. Does schedule address environmental restriction periods?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 24. Does schedule address local events, holidays, etc.?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 25. Does schedule address special material procurement time?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 26. Does schedule address removal of hazardous materials as   |   |              |     |  |            |
| necessary?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 27. Does schedule address utility relocation timeline?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| 28. Does schedule address railroad coordination as necessary?   |   |              |     |  |            |
| 29. Are utility durations taken into account with the overall   |   |              |     |  |            |
| construction schedule? Is it realistic?   | - |              | +   |  |            |
| 30. Rail shop drawing submittals, if known require a long lead time, a note should be placed in contract indicating such. | ł |              |     |  | 1          |
| 31. Are there any lead times for materials that need to be  |   | ╁            | 1-  |  | <u> </u>   |
| considered in the overall schedule of the project.  |   |              |     |  |            |
| L Special Materials/Conditions  |   |              |     |  |            |
| * 1. Pertinent provisions and restrictions clearly indicated?   |   | PH (MASS)(48 |     |  | Manganer . |
| * 2. Local conditions?  | ╅ | -            | 1   | <del>                                     </del> |            |
| 3. Has the cost implications of special construction methods or   | + | T            | 1   |  |            |
| conditions been considered in the project?  |   |              |     |  |            |
| * 4. How does the project affect the community?   | + | T            | 1   |  | 1          |
| * 5. Are there any special events that need to be considered?   | + |              | +   |  |            |
| 6. Are there outside impacts that are pushing the overall job costs   | + | +-           | -   | 1  |            |
| up that might be mitigated in some manner?  |   |              |     |  |            |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Note<br>No. | REVIEWER COMMENTS            |
|-------------|------------------------------|
|             | ·                            |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             |                              |
|             | itional sheets as necessary) |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

| Note    | DESIGNER COMMENTS               |
|---------|---------------------------------|
| No.     |                                 |
| ·       |                                 |
| -       |                                 |
|         |                                 |
| ,       |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
| ***     |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
|         |                                 |
| (Attach | additional sheets as necessary) |

Project Constructability Review (Stage 3)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention
Page 10 of 10